IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.6794 OF 2005

Mr.Om Pratap Singh ..Applicant

Vs.

M/s.Arihant Lubricants
Pvt.Ltd. & Anr. ..Respondents

...
Mr.Shailesh Kantharia Advocate for Applicant
Mr.Rajesh More A.P.P. for the State
...

CORAM: SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.
DATE : OCTOBER 26, 2005

P.C.

1. Heard the learned advocate for the applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The applicant is seeking quashing of process issued by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 30th Court, Kurla in C.C.No.6629/SS/2005. In the said case process was issued against the applicant under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

3. For the reasons recorded in the decision of this Court in the case of **V.K.Jain and others Vs. Pratap V. Padode reported in 2005(3) Mh.L.J.778,** I am of the opinion that the applicant has an efficacious remedy of preferring revision against

the order of Magistrate issuing process. Hence, in my view, it would be appropriate that the applicant prefers a revision before the concerned Sessions Court against the order of the Magistrate issuing process.

4. Liberty is granted to the applicant to prefer the necessary revision before the concerned Sessions Court. The learned advocate for the applicant makes a statement that the necessary revision will be preferred within five weeks from today. In view of this statement, the trial Court shall not proceed with the trial for a period of five weeks.

5. On the necessary revision being preferred by the applicant before the concerned Sessions Court, the concerned Sessions Court shall dispose of the matter on merits after hearing the necessary parties.

6. Criminal Application is disposed of.

[V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.]